UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/582,536	06/09/2006	Toru Shoji	TAN-123	9992
	7590 09/19/200 ROBERTS, LLP	EXAMINER		
ATTORNEYS AT LAW			WYSZOMIERSKI, GEORGE P	
P.O. BOX 484 PRINCETON, NJ 08542-0484			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,			1793	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/19/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Commence	10/582,536	SHOJI ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	George P. Wyszomierski	1793				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on						
	-· action is non-final.					
<i>,</i> —						
closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
diesed in assertantes with the practice and a	x parte Quayre, 1000 0.2. 11, 10	0 0.0. 210.				
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner						
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acce	epted or b) \square objected to by the E	Examiner.				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the o	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	37 CFR 1.85(a).				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti	on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received.					
2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents		on No.				
application from the International Bureau	•	2.0.3				
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachment(s)						
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary	(PTO_413)				
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date						
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) Notice of Informal Pa	atent Application				
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>6/9/06, 12/5/06</u> . 6) Other:						

Application/Control Number: 10/582,536

Page 2

Art Unit: 1793

1. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The term "moldedin" in the last line of clam 1 and elsewhere in the present application is not a standard term in the art, and thus its definition is ambiguous. Further, this term does not appear to be simply a misprint of "molded in". Clarification is required as to what steps/procedures would fall within the scope of the invention as recited in claim 1. Claims dependent upon claim 1 are likewise rejected under this statute.

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krotz et al. (U.S. Patent 5,915,160) in view of Newkirk et al. (U.S. Patent 5,007,476).

Krotz et al. discloses a process substantially as claimed, i.e. forming a powder of a material that meets the limitations of instant claims 5, 6, and 11-20 (such as gold and a dilute element such as a rare earth element), oxidizing this material in a ball mill, followed by consolidating (taken by the examiner to be substantially equivalent to "moldedin solidifying"). With regard to instant claims 4, 8, 9 and 10, this product can then be extruded; see Krotz column 3, lines 29-30. With respect to instant claim 2, the ball mill used in the Krotz process would appear to meet the definition of an "attritor" as presently claimed.

Krotz does not disclose that the ball mill includes water as required by the instant claims. Newkirk indicates that it was known in the art, at the time of the invention, to include water in a ball mill used to form oxidized metal matrix composite materials; see Newkirk column 33, lines 54-67. With respect to claims 3 and 7, any water used in the prior art process is held to be "ultrapure", in the absence of any numerical or other objective definition of this term.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, carrying out the process of Krotz et al., to include water in the ball mill as taught by Newkirk et al., in order to ensure proper oxidation of the material undergoing the milling process.

- 4. The remainder of the art cited on the attached PTO-892 and 1449 forms is of interest. This art is held to be no more relevant to the claimed invention than the art as applied in the rejections, supra.
- 5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to George Wyszomierski whose telephone number is (571) 272-1252. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. Eastern time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Roy King, can be reached on (571) 272-1244. All patent application related correspondence transmitted by facsimile must be directed to the <u>central facsimile number</u>, (571)-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/George Wyszomierski/ Primary Examiner Art Unit 1793

GPW September 16, 2008